DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 188 SP 004 810

AUTHOR	Collins, Evan R.
TITLE	The Impossible Imperatives: Power, Authority, and Decision Making in Teacher Education.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	21p.; Twelfth Charles W. Hunt Lecture
AVAILABLE FROM	Order Dept., American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. ($0.75; discount on orders of five or more)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Cooperating Teachers, Educational Objectives, *Educational Philosophy, Educational Problems, Facility Expansion, *Teacher Education, *Teacher Educators, *Universities

ABSTRACT

The past year has found universities in trouble. During the previous decade, the emphasis was on the expansion of existing institutions and the development of new ones in order to accommodate the growing numbers of students. However, there was no grasp of the major contemporary problems in the social and political fields and the changes which they have produced in the motivations, aspirations, and values of students. The present generation is different, both in composition and character, from its predecessors. The preparation of teachers and school personnel has suffered from additional problems and has failed to maintain the balance between practical experience and academic prestige. Cooperating teachers have not been called on to participate as equals in program discussions or policy formation, but have been treated as second-class citizens, with the result that the teachers are now claiming the right to decide who shall be candidates for the profession and by what standards teachers shall be prepared. There are two related solutions--to redefine the purposes of the university and to realign the preparation of teachers. Both call for a distinction to be made between the concepts of power and authority, with the purpose of the university recognized as a precarious consensus between the practitioners in the classroom and the faculty members. (MBM)

ED049188

The Lecture Series

The CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURES, given over a period of twelve years at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, commencing in 1960, were established by action of the Executive Committee of the Association. The Lecture Series was conceived as a professional tribute to the long years of leadership and service which Dr. Hunt has given to teacher education as a teacher, a university dean, a college president, secretary-treasurer of the American Association of Teachers Colleges, secretary-treasurer of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and a consultant to the Board of Directors of AACTE.

Charles W. Hunt has combined vision with practicality in encouraging voluntary cooperation among higher education institutions for the improvement of teacher education. The AACTE is proud to acknowledge its great respect and appreciation for Dr. Hunt's educational statesmanship, his devotion to teacher education, his insights into human behavior, and his personal friendship.

A Life Devoted to Education

CHARLES WESLEY HUNT, born in Charlestown, New Hampshire, October 20, 1880, educated at Brown University (A.B. 1904), Columbia University (A.M. 1910, Ph.D. 1922); teacher of English, Vermont Academy, Saxtons River, 1904-06; Moses Brown School, Providence, Rhode Island, 1906-08; teacher, Horace Mann School, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1908-09; supervising principal, Union School, Briar Cliff Manor, New York, 1910-13; supervisor, Children's Aid Society Schools, New York City, 1913-14; assistant secretary, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1914-16; vice-principal, Horace Mann School, New York City, 1918-21; director of extramural instruction, University of Pittsburgh, 1921-24; acting dean, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, 1923-24; dean, Cleveland School of Education, 1924-28; professor of education and dean, School of Education, Western Reserve University, 1928-33; principal, New York State Normal School, Oneonta, New York, 1933-42; president, New York State Teachers College, Oneonta, New York, 1942-51; secretary-treasurer, American Association of Teachers Colleges, 1928-48; secretary-treasurer, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1948-53; and consultant to AACTE Board of Directors since 1953.

If anyone can be truly said to be a "teacher of teachers," Evan R. Collins—Van Collins, as he is affectionately known to his friends—surely merits that right. Directly after earning his A.B. at Dartmouth in 1933, he became instructor and director of program at Tabor Academy in Marion, Massachusetts. He received his Ed. M. (1938) from Harvard and went on to become director of placement (1938), then assistant dean of the Graduate School of Education at Harvard (1939-46). Dr. Collins completed his doctoral work (Ed. D., Harvard, 1946), taking time out for wartime service as chief of operations analysis with the Second Army Air Force (1943-45), and later as special consultant to the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Dr. Collins was born in New York in 1911. He was claimed exclusively by the East Coast, but he defected briefly to the Midwest to spend 1946-49 as dean of the College of Education at Ohio University in Athens. Soon thereafter he was named president of the State University of New York at Albany and served there long and honorably during the twenty years from 1949-69. In September of 1969 he assumed his present post as professor of higher education at Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts. He wears two hats inasmuch as he is concurrently director of the Institute for College and University Administrators of the American Council on Education.

His affiliation with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education has been of such long duration and distinction as to constitute a separate career in itself. He was a member and sometime chairman of the Association's Committee on Studies; he was twice president of the Association from 1964-66. He is currently chairman of the AACTE Committee on Government Relations.

Dr. Collins is a longtime member and former director of the American Council on Education. He has been honored by Union University, Tennessee, with an Sc.D., with an LL.D. from Lehigh University, Pennsylvania, and Docteur, h.c., from the Université de Strasbourg. He is also an Officier de l'Ordre des Palmes Académiques.

The AACTE is pleased to be able to extend to educators at large, by means of this Hunt Lecture, Dr. Collins' fresh insights on teacher education distilled from a long and distinguished career.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY AACTE

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright © 1971 by

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036

SBN: 910052-51-4

THE IMPOSSIBLE IMPERATIVES: Power, Authority, and Decision Making in Teacher Education

Evan R. Collins

The Twelfth Charles W. Hunt Lecture

Presented at the Twenty-third Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Chicago, Illinois
February 24, 1971

On behalf of all who are here, I welcome this opportunity to join in doing honor to Charles W. Hunt. We salute him as a true pioneer in the field in which we are all engaged, one of a very few who early seized a vision and worked to make it real in the institution he led, in his wide-ranging contacts with colleagues, and in this national organization he nurtured from beginnings fifty-three years ago. We salute him, too, as one old-timer who has stayed young and still active —a valued counselor at meetings of the Board of Directors, a vigorous participant in today's events.

For us all, this Annual Meeting is a time to renew our friendships with our colleagues and counterparts at other institutions, and to swap professional gossip. More, it is a time to inquire into the state-of-the-art, to assess the year just passed, to try to discern the murky future—even to plan to impose some shape upon it.

We must surely agree that 1970 was an amorphous year, a period with few distinctive characteristics. Its major developments were continuous, they were *culminations* of trends; there were no *new* trends. Since Kent State, and Jackson State, and Cambodia, the campuses have been generally quiet; we are almost tempted to suggest, "Not much seems to be happening now." That would be a bitter suggestion: that only violence is noteworthy. It is rather an urgent reminder that we cannot construe this relative calm to mean not much *needs* to happen or, worse, that we can go back to the good old days that never were. Instead, we recognize it as a time to plan change, when we are not pushed by events so that we merely react. We can now seize the initiative. We know we still have our deficiencies; we know they need to be overcome. We will not be misled nor sidetracked by calm or

SP004810

apathy or exhaustion, by the old smug belief that nothing needs to be changed.

This awareness, this sense that 1971 is a time for decision, for initiative, is clear in the theme for this Annual Meeting—*Power, Authority, and Decision Making in Teacher Education.* My title, *The Impossible Imperatives,* reflects my feeling that the tasks we face are so difficult as to seem impossible, so urgent as to be imperative.

I. There is no need to remind ourselves of our worries and woes. This year, as we meet, we share a sense of sharp concern. The university is in trouble. I refer not only to our precarious financial position, although that is a symptom. Our basic *malaise* is more deep-rooted. We need not be reminded how many candidates in the 1970 elections won votes by lambasting higher education. Led by the Administration's acrimonious alliterator, spokesmen for both left and right found the campus fair game, and—to our concern—found the voters agreeing with them.

Why did these critics find such ready response? Certainly they represented a shift in the public's opinion of us. During the 1950's and most of the Sixties, higher education reached new heights of public esteem and affirmation and support. Faculty salaries rose, legislatures were generous in their appropriations, and more and more people applied for college admission; we felt wanted. The G.I. Bill had been the first national affirmation of the principle that, whatever we meant by it, higher education should be open to a whole generation. We were only approaching the implementation of this ideal, but its impact was already apparent in the programs and purposes of our colleges.

Under these pleasant pressures, we began the Sixties, mildly protesting but not prepared for the changes necessitated by two factors: the dramatic increase in numbers and the less easily measured but farther-reaching revolution of values in the college population. We talked almost happily about a national population increase of more than three million a year—adding the population of a city like Phoenix, Arizona, anew each month —about a birth every seven-and-a-half seconds, eleven thousand future students born each day. We did not question whether the higher education we had developed for the few would be appropriate for the majority of the age-group now readying for college; even less did we question

whether this new generation of college-goers was, indeed, quite like its predecessor—in life style, in aspirations, in value structure.

We did, then, an impressive job of meeting the quantitative needs—building the plants and staffing them, expanding existing institutions, and developing new ones. In our understandable preoccupation with these immediate problems, we had little time or energy for change. We were largely concerned with extending higher education as we had known it, without serious reconsideration of its continuing appropriateness for a vastly extended college population. There was experimentation—*we can point to a Green Bay, a* Monteith, a New College, a Santa Cruz, to scattered innovations in organization or curriculum. But in many cases even these were essentially experiments in management, attempts to improve the grouping of students, or the organization of instruction, to do better what we had long ago agreed it was our mission to do. We "raised" admission standards, but not by changing them, but merely by applying the old standards more rigorously, and we made corresponding adjustments in curricular regulations.

Perhaps we oversold ourselves, plugging the old reliable product to the new market. Have you seriously read your catalogue to see what it is you seem to promise your institution will do? Whatever our local variation of the program in general studies, can it truly develop in students an appreciative awareness of the ways of problem-solving in science, a grasp of the major contemporary problems in the social and political fields, an appreciation of the major modes of thought and expression in the humanistic areas, a mature set of values, a well-grounded preference for the good and the beautiful, and a lifetime devotion to learning?

"In the majority of the 2,300 institutions . . . ," Lewis Mayhew reported a year ago, "students enter and leave and seem to grow not much more than they would had the time been spent in war, work, or welfare." * He is supported by Trent's finding that college graduates ". . . could be judged largely apathetic to intellectual inquiry and social issues." **

---

* Paper developed for American Council on Education, Institute for College and University Administrators, November 1969. (Unpublished)

** Trent, James W., and Medsker, Leland L. *Beyond High School.* San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968. p. 232.

Perhaps our claims have been a bit overdrawn. Perhaps these were functions our institutions could serve, objectives we could realistically seek, *when our student group was more narrowly selected.* Most of us, I submit, find them unattainable under the pressures of the new numbers we undertake to serve. But more fundamental is the question of whether such objectives—and the programs we developed long ago to attain them—are not only attainable but *appropriate* for the new student population. This group is different not only because it is larger and more representative of the age group, it is also different—*how* different we do not yet know—because of the impact of a whole new complex of social stresses and generational pressures upon it. To quote Margaret Mead, "We have for the first time in our history a youth generation that actually does know more than their elders." But no member of the parental generation can honestly say of their experience, "Yes, I know; I remember how it was for me." And we are only beginning to recognize that, under the impact of such deep-rooted social change, the motivations, the aspirations, the values are changed, too; their expectations of the college or university—and thus for them, at least—the *purposes* of the university have changed.

Thus, in brief, we did an impressive job in the Sixties of extending higher education, as we knew it, to a vastly expanded group of students. We've been somewhat less successful in doing all that we advertised for those students, probably because we promised too much. Less impressive still has been our readiness to review whether that, any longer, is the job that needs to be done. The group to be educated, because it is a more representative fraction of the age cohort, is different in *composition.* The group, because its experience is new, is different in *character.* Its values are different and what it needs to obtain from the college or university may well be different.

So we gather here with a sense that the university is in trouble.

II. Our concern, as members of institutions admittedly in trouble, is not relieved but deepened when we turn, within this context, to our own field, the preparation of teachers and other school officers. All the problems harassing the campus as a whole are familiar to us in professional education. Students in education are not

exempt from the stresses and pressures that affect all students. Nor are our courses particularly singled out as shining exceptions to student charges of poor teaching, or of impersonality, or irrelevance. Indeed, to the complex of all-university problems most of us in teacher education must add a clutch peculiarly our own.

These special problems of ours turn on the question of professionalism and the professional component in the preparation of teachers. At least since the time of Samuel Hall's normal academy, professional educators of teachers have been trying to maintain a precarious balance: between, on the one hand, the need for practical, clinical experience in the work of the classroom teacher of children; and, on the other, the desire for academic prestige, or at least, respectability as defined and controlled by the liberal arts faculty in our colleges and universities.

The history of teacher education in this country has been the history of three simple revolutionary ideas: that teachers need special preparation for teaching; that the provision of this preparation is a matter of public, *i.e.* social, concern; that the study of this field is properly in the schools. Hall's school at Concord represented acceptance of the first of these ideas, that teachers need professional training. For the other two ideas to develop, to travel fourteen miles down the road and gain some acceptance in the Harvard yard as an A.M. in T. program, took almost a hundred years. And the balance between professional clinical work and work in the academic disciplines is still a precarious one.

It has been the function and responsibility of the professional school or department to effect a constructive reconciliation of the disparate elements and to maintain a balanced program, enlisting the cooperation of the liberal arts faculty for both general education and subject matter preparation, and the participation of the practitioners in the field to provide clinical experiences and supervision. The professional faculty looks both ways and shares the expertise of both groups as it blends both elements with its own teaching in the program. This program-making responsibility and authority is central to the policy decisions governing teacher education in the university. The faculties of the schools and departments of education stand at the pivot of this sometimes uneasy alliance. They must take the lead in continuous adjustment and accommodation.

In the process, we not infrequently find that we have alienated our associates in the field, without ever having made unshakable allies of our colleagues in the arts and sciences.

We are vulnerable, and culpable, to both sides, but especially in our relationships with our colleagues in the field. Many, if not most, arrangements for student teaching and laboratory experiences are essentially exploitative—rarely of the children, the pupils; not infrequently of the neophytes, the college students; and principally of the classroom teachers. The laboratory function, at one time served largely by the campus school of many colleges, now falls more heavily on the public and private schools because increased enrollments in teacher education have hastened the demise of the "practice school." This service by schools and teachers is usually sold as a professional obligation; this is probably a valid basis, and it recognizes the inadequacy of the other common forms of recompense—the tuition waiver, the token stipend, the annual free dinner in the college cafeteria, at which the student teachers "entertain" their critic teachers and the dinner speaker extolls and applauds the true professional collaboration between institutions, cooperating teachers, school systems, as represented at the once-a-year festivities.

But most of us would be forced to acknowledge that, in fact, we too seldom invite our field colleagues to contribute as equals to our program discussions, or to participate fully in policy formulation. Indeed, within the closer relationship of the university faculty, the status of the campus schoolteacher has traditionally been that of the second-class citizen. Fifteen years ago, A. R. Mead put it in strong terms: "By and large, what has been done to these workers and about them has been a shame and a disgrace to the profession. They have been paid smaller salaries . . . not allowed to have faculty rank in many cases, not allowed to share in faculty deliberations in most cases, sometimes sneered at by persons who should know better . . . ." * I submit that we're not often doing much better today.

This kind of snobbism within our ranks reflects our own use of the irrelevant standards we decry

---

* A. R. Mead and others. "Present and Future Uses of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education." *Functions of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education.* (Edited by Alex F. Perrodin.) Washington, D. C.: Association for Student Teaching, 1955, p. 139.

when they are used against us. Since the Greeks, disdain of manual activities has characterized elitist university education, has isolated intellectual pursuits from their social milieu, and has rendered suspect the elements of professional preparation in the undergraduate years. Too often teacher educators have accepted this irrelevant basis for academic prestige and perpetuated the false dichotomy between work and academic worth.

Whatever its roots, our failure to recognize our classroom colleagues as full partners leaves us open to charges we can disregard only at our peril. We should not be amazed that our unilateral policy making is now questioned and is, indeed, in a fair way to be curtailed. The NEA, through TEPS, is frank to acknowledge its plans to take over the direction of teacher education. The directors of your Association were assured by the representatives of TEPS at a recent meeting that neither the colleges and universities, nor the professional faculties, but "*teachers* must have the major voice . . . they must be largely responsible for determining who shall be candidates for the profession and by what standards teachers shall be prepared (including accreditation of institutions)." *

The 1971 budget for our largest school system, New York City, was headlined in the *New York Times* as placing "the highest priority" on teacher training through "learning cooperatives" set up by the school system in each borough. Other school systems and the public offer additional evidence of our having forfeited their confidence in institutionally-dominated decision making. As of December, sixteen states had enacted professional practices legislation and twenty-five states had enacted negotiation statutes for teachers. Both types of action, clearly, give support to the program of the organized teachers. And teacher educators cannot at this juncture count on strong and enthusiastic support from their colleagues in the liberal arts. Yet our need for such support increases as it becomes clearer that the program-making, policy-formulating authority of the professional faculty is what is at stake. That authority —over the curriculum for teacher education, over standards for admission to programs in teacher

* National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. "The Meaning of Accountability: A Working Paper," the Association. Washington, D. C.: November 1970, p. 6. (Mimeo.)

education and for performance in our courses—has long been vested in the colleges and universities preparing teachers. It is passing from us, in part by our default and forfeit, in part as a result of aggressive organization policy.

The hour is already late.

III. My remarks so far may seem a somewhat grim catalogue of problems, hardly calculated to launch a wave of optimism over this Annual Meeting. I wish I could simplify the difficulties, or even specify them sufficiently clearly so that solutions seem more readily apparent. But our present problems are both complex and difficult, and their solutions are not subject to simple prescription. Although I began by indicating our present opportunity to shape the future, we may indeed conclude, when we really face the task, that the imperatives are impossible, although the impossibilities are so clearly imperative. I would suggest only two general rubrics, which may help order our efforts by suggesting priorities.

We face two related tasks. The first is redefining the purposes of the university. In this task, we need to proceed not as though we were wielding power but, rather, exercising authority. The second task is that of realignment for the preparation of teachers. Here we need to unite in the common task—with the authority this unity generates—those who now pursue the divisive tactics of power. In both cases we begin with the nature of power and with a distinction between power and authority. Power (even as in "power to the people") commonly denotes force, and assumes that, by the exercise of strength, we can coerce consent. Short of naked physical force, the exercise of any power requires, of course, the act of consent. The recipient of an order must perceive it, comprehend it, and consent to it, if the order is to have effect. This consent may be engineered crudely, as in a dictatorship, by making the alternatives more unpleasant than consent (although coercion feeds on itself, requiring more and more drastic enforcement). Such use of power ignores or subverts our cherished concept of the consent of the governed, which undergirds democratic organization and the development of legitimate authority. Power, which is coercive, *enforces* consent, and invites sabotage. Authority, which is legitimate, *earns* consent, by developing preponderant agreement on ends and purposes. To

achieve objectives to which he subscribes, the individual consents to the exercise of the authority he acknowledges as legitimate.

In the American university, coercion as a support of authority has not been significant, even if some would have it so. As Glazer points out, "When authority there loses the capacity to act based on common acceptance of its legitimacy, it has no other source of power to draw upon." * In the university, in theory, administrative officers exercise power delegated to them by the trustees, in whom it is legally vested as representatives of the larger social body. But in practice, the trustees often no longer have effective *power* to delegate; it has been legally diminished by the courts and legislatures (notably in the areas of civil rights and due process), and by the unions (particularly in salary matters, personnel practices, and working conditions) and, increasingly, operationally eroded by successive refusals to consent to its exercise (most often by students).

Such frustration of legal power always poses the temptation to travel the authoritarian route—to escalate the penalties, to make the alternatives to the acceptance of asserted authority so progressively unpleasant, and finally unbearable, that at last not even the strongest will withhold compliance. But we know where that road leads, and we reject it.

The converse error is the cop-out, the abdication by the university of powers which are contested. It is tempting, when frustration runs high, to turn to a different source of authority when the authority of the university fails—to turn over to police and courts, for example, the regulation of all but purely academic matters, thus surrendering the privilege of institutional self-regulation to external civil authority.**

The more productive alternative lies in the exercise of leadership, in the recognition that only *earned* authority can command continuing support, or at least acceptance, each new day, each new issue, by tapping anew the reservoir of commonly accepted motivations, aspirations, or formulations

---

* Glazer, Nathan. "The Six Roots of Campus Trouble." Address to the American Alumni Council, adapted for the *Harvard Bulletin* 73: 1.

** Cf. McConnell, T. R. "Faculty Interests in Value Change and Power Conflict." *Value Change and Power Conflict in Higher Education.* Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, and Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colorado: 1969. p. 69.

of the university's purposes. Some authority accrues to the designation of special administrative responsibilities; more is inherent in the acknowledged expertise of the scholar or the administrator, or is earned anew in each act of leadership, in decision making which enlists the assent of the group. Such a course of action necessitates a high degree of skill in leadership—in anticipating which problems will be critical or perhaps in selecting which problems to emphasize—while there is still time for the processes of participatory democracy to work, to be successful, and thus to generate new consensus.

Such authority is, of course, based upon goals shared and accepted; authority gains its legitimacy from dedication to these common goals. Without such acceptance by all groups in the university, decision making deteriorates into power wielding, with a greater or lesser degree of coercion implicit in decisions. It becomes imperative, then, for the university to redefine its goals, not only to clarify its aims but also to enlist support, to earn acknowledgement of its legitimacy. Here the matters of purposes, of process, and of product are inextricably interwoven. *We cannot expect true consensus regarding goals which result from the exercise of arbitrary power, or from an empty "ploy" aimed only at consent without realistic participation. We may reasonably expect renewed support —the acknowledgement of authority—only from those who have given assent to the process and thus to the products of decision making.* We must, in fact, operate not as though we were wielding power but, rather exercising acknowledged authority. I recognize, of course, how difficult such a prescription is to follow, especially when the patient is gravely sick. A time of crisis is not one in which to develop credibility and confidence. But the present period of relative calm gives us that opportunity and, therefore, imposes that obligation.

The goals to be sought must, we know, be *shared*, not imposed by any part of the university upon the whole. Any attempt at imposition, any use of even the forms of force, impugns the validity of the goals and subverts the consensus that supports legitimate authority. Is it realistic to expect such consensus? When we seek substantial agreement on the purposes of the university, what problems may we anticipate? The most immediate and visible problem is the emergence of a youth culture which differs so sharply from its parent culture as

to seem revolutionary. Its values are so radically different that some observers see no possibility of accommodation. Nathan Glazer, for example, sees the "challenge to intellectual and rational values, (to) everything involved in the process of learning. For the youth culture has . . . some favored cultural orientations: mysticism, astrology, science fiction, encounters. All this undercuts the critical functions of the colleges and universities." It is, he says, "the rejection of all the values which are incorporated in the current curriculum—balance, objectivity, rationality, analysis." *

Without questioning whether these values are indeed incorporated into our present curriculum, and whatever the merits of such a description as Glazer's, it offers us little basis or hope for a constructive resolution of the problem. Its real danger is that it tempts us to view the student as an adversary, as an alien, an antagonistic element we must overcome if we are to maintain the university. This is an insidious approach, seducing us to the use of power rather than the development of authority. This is the extreme of the *Campus would be a fine place if only it weren't for the students* syndrome, and we forswear it.

We are not describing here the one percent of students on the extreme left and right, those whom Keniston and Lerner describe as the unholy alliance against the campus, who are together forcing an identity of violence upon students.** Instead, we are discussing the other ninety-nine percent (no one's silent majority). This is the group with whom we must communicate, and whose constructive contributions must be comprehended in our reappraisal of the purposes of the university.

They are not antagonists, but allies. Disillusioned and sometimes despairing as they may sound, they are groping, as we are, not for a return to the dear old days and not toward a destruction of all that is established, but for a new formulation that will combine the enduring values with a new relevance. They are more demanding than we, in formulating purposes for their lives and, hence, for their universities. We have underestimated the stress of a society characterized by affluence, the absence of noble goals, of technology without a tradition of service and social responsibility. We have ignored their dilemma. They face

* Glazer, *op. cit.*

** Keniston, Kenneth, and Lerner, Michael. "The Unholy Alliance Against the Campus." *New York Times Magazine*, November 8, 1970.

a world they cannot accept because they cannot reconcile its idealism and its shortcomings in practice, so they read hypocrisy. They feel a need to reform the world by next Tuesday, but they have to learn to live in it now, *with* all its injustices. We must not be put off when we find that their revulsion at insincerity leads them to overreact—to think that strong feeling, honestly expressed, justifies unreasonable action.

Yet they are not adversaries, for they are more than allies, they are our students. We have worked hard to teach them a concern for social justice and peace in the world and the improvement of the quality of human life, and we should be proud that they now seek those ends, however gropingly. As Richard Gill observed, radical issues are far too serious to be left to the radicals.

We need to join with them, not in politicizing the university to become an instrument to achieve these goals, but in leading the university in its traditional and distinctive purposes of study and learning. The study of our society's crises and its goals and motivations are the proper business of the university. Such goals we can share. Sharing, we can together support not the forms of power, but the usages of consent, and the acknowledgement of that legitimate authority through which voluntary society establishes and achieves its common goals. Such an end we earnestly seek.

IV. We have been saying that the expression of the purposes of the university is always a precarious consensus, a fragile compromise; the power to lead, to formulate goals and pursue them, cannot be legally granted, not formally delegated, not merely asserted, but must be earned and re-earned, by those who would maintain and make effective the delicate strength of the university.

The same general considerations govern the complex of crucial decisions determining the program of teacher education. This formulation, too, is based not on any grant of legal power, but on the much more difficult and demanding development of a consensus, a sense of colleagueship, of the patient pursuit of true participation by all who can contribute to a solution of the problem. Engaged in the formulation must, of course, be those who have the key contributions to make—the practitioners in the classrooms of our elementary and secondary schools and the concerned college faculty members in the fields of the arts and

sciences—led, hopefully, by the professional faculties in education.

To reestablish this consensus, we have many broken relationships to repair, many breaches to restore. We in the professional field of teacher education need to acknowledge our past shortcomings, and to face up to the results of our neglect.

One such result we do not need to acknowledge; it is already clear and already upon us. Our neglect of the classroom teachers as colleagues in program making and our exploitation of them as co-workers have led to their demands for a stronger voice in policy. Indeed, if we take TEPS at its word, as quoted earlier, that organization wants, if not the *sole* voice in policy determination, certainly the dominant one—"the major voice," so that teachers "must be largely responsible" for determining who enters the profession, by what standards they will be prepared, how they will be educated in service, and which institutions will be accredited.

General acceptance of this position, understandable as it is, would be a dangerous step backward in teacher education. Acceptance of the TEPS position would deny the university-based scholarly quality of teacher education. It would, for the profession, constitute a major step toward syndicalism. It would divert attention and energy from the main job of the schools to a debilitating, unprofessional scramble for power.

Concerning the first of these points, the university-level roots of teacher education, note was made earlier that this realization gained general acknowledgement only after acceptance of the idea that teaching requires special professional preparation, and that the provision of such preparation is a matter of social concern and public policy. Only in the last few decades has it been generally acknowledged that teachers need themselves to be educated at least to the level of the baccalaureate, that the study and development of the field of education as a proper subject of scholarly inquiry, as an emerging discipline, requires university-level attention. Only as pedagogy emerged from its "code-book" or "how-to-do-it" stage and established a theoretical base, did we trace and strengthen its roots in the academic disciplines. Then only did the classroom practitioners acknowledge the need for a theoretical structure which extended beyond the range of their daily problems, or the need for the formulation of the professional

program of preparation to rest increasingly in the professional faculty.

On the second point, which we have referred to as the first step toward syndicalism, there is no need to remind this group that the educational enterprise is conducted not for the collective teaching staff, but for the health of the total society as it is enhanced by the provision of education for its children. Absolute control of an occupation or profession by those who practice it directly, be they teachers, lawyers, physicians, civil servants, is syndicalism rather than democracy. As W. H. Cowley pointed out long ago, its adoption "would mean that military men would completely control national defense establishments, that clergymen would similarly have exclusive domain over churches, and that civil servants would be unrestrained in the management of civil governments." Organizations of classroom teachers quite understandably tend to center their organizational concerns on matters of teacher welfare—working conditions, pay scales, and the development of political leverage to assure these ends. These are important, surely, to teachers, but they are not the aims of the schools, nor of the programs to prepare teachers.

In addition to the dangers of sacrificing the university character of teacher education, and of the devious shortcomings of syndicalism, we must avoid, if we can, the costly scramble for dominance, in which the schoolchildren would be the first losers. In a contest of sheer strength, there would be little question; the organized schoolteachers have the *power*, especially as they organize to force consent. Ours is the responsibility to earn once again a position of authority, based on agreement on our common goals and responsibilities. The school systems, the organized teaching profession, the institutions of higher education, each has a distinctive and important function; all have common concern for effective educational programs. For any one of the partners either to default on its distinctive responsibility or to seek to infringe on another's would endanger the total enterprise. If college and university teacher educators default on the exercise of their distinctive responsibilities, they leave to the teachers in elementary and secondary classrooms the responsibility for developing and teaching programs of teacher education. For this they have neither direct preparation nor opportunity to address themselves to the problem.

Instead, members of this Association, as leaders in American teacher education, need again to assert the complex nature of the teaching responsibility and the implications of this complexity for the programs of preparation, they need to reflect and rebuild in those programs the essential sense of colleagueship, so that the programs may be effective. Our relationships with school systems and with classroom teachers, among individuals or organizations, are the relationships of equals—*of equals with differentiated responsibilities and with accountability for different functions.* The established school systems, through their administrative staffs and classroom teachers, are, and should be, held primarily responsible for the education of pupils at elementary and secondary levels. For the education of teachers at all levels we hold to account the teacher educators whose leadership is represented here tonight. It's time we got on with the job.

It will not be easy. The job is complex, and we are confused. The tasks may well seem impossible: to redefine the university, to maintain its ancient values and give them new force for a generation more humanely motivated; to reestablish in our universities a colleagueship in teacher education that may yield programs truly professional —these tasks you may well consider impossible, imperative though they be.

The power to effect these decisions is not ceded in courts or contracts or laws, nor is it granted by boards or legislatures. But there is power also in patience and persistence and persuasion. There is power in understanding, and in the values and the vision of our profession. And there is power in knowing that, despite our inadequacies, the job must be done because we dare not fail. Thus is the task imperative, impossible though it may seem.

In James Gould Cozzens' book, *The Last Adam,* there is this passage:

"Don't be cynical," Judge Coates said, " . . . Nobody promises you a good time or an easy time. I don't know who it was said when we think of the past we regret, and when we think of the future we fear. And with reason. But no bets are off. There is the present to think of, and as long as you live there always will be. In the present, every day is a miracle. The world gets up in the morning and is fed and goes to work, and in the evening it comes home and is fed again and perhaps has a little amusement and goes to sleep. To make that possible, so much has to be done by so many people that on the face of it, it

is impossible. Well, every day we do it; and every day, come hell, come high water, we're going to have to go on doing it, as well as we can."

"So it seems," said Abner.

"Yes, so it seems," said Judge Coates, "and so it is, and so it will be! And that's where you come in. That's all we want of you."

Abner said, "What do you want of me?"

"We just want you to do the impossible," Judge Coates said.

God grant we may find success.

The First Eleven Lectures

1960—The Dimensions of Professional Leadership
Laurence DeFee Haskew

1961—Revolution in Instruction
Lindley P. Stiles

1962—Imperatives for Excellence in Teacher Education
J. W. Maucker

1963—Africa, Teacher Education, and the United States
Karl W. Bigelow

1964—The Certification of Teachers: The Restricted State Approved Program Approach
James B. Conant

1965—Perspective on Action in Teacher Education
Florence B. Stratemeyer

1966—Leadership for Intellectual Freedom in Higher Education
William B. Spalding

1967—Tradition and Innovation in Teacher Education
Rev. Charles F. Donovan, S.J.

1968—Teachers: The Need and the Task
Felix C. Robb

1969—A Consumer's Hopes and Dreams for Teacher Education
Elizabeth D. Koontz

1970—Realignments for Teacher Education
Fred T. Wilhelms